3
(1) CHOOL

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2839 /2003

PETITIONER

1. S.K. Dhanelia, S/o Late C.L. Dhanelia, aged about 56 yrs Occu-Room Officer (Kakch-Adhikari) C.G.M.S.M. Board, Present Address-G-1, Awasiya Parisar, M.S.M. Pension Bada, Raipur, Permanent Address – E-8/32, Bharat Nagar, Shahpura, Bhopal (C.G.)

P. R. No. 2613/03 Presented by Shri P.C. Tiwari dated 02.09.03

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. Union of India thorough Secretary Deptt. Of Personnel & Training, Govt. Of India New Delhi

2. State of Chhattisgarh through secretary Chhattisgarh Higher Secondary Board D.K.S. Bhavan Raipur C.G.

2. State of Madhya Pradesh through Secretary M.P. Higher Secondary Board Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)

प्रतिपक्ष आयुक्त एच.के. शुक्ला बिलासपुर (छ.ग.) 2410 बिलासपुर तहसील कोर्ट

RECEIVED COPY. W/1 2.9.03 CLERK TO A.G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS AND CERTIORARI.

(01) PARTICULARS ABOUT THE PETITIONER:

The details of the Petitioner are shown in the cause title.

(02) PARTICULARS ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS :

The details of the respondents are shown in the cause title.

(03) PARTICULARS ABOUT THE ORDERS AGAINST WHICH THE PETITION IS BEING MADE:

(37)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 2839 of 2003

Petitioner S. K. Dhanelia

Versus

Respondents Union of India & others

Single Bench : Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

Miss Binu Pathak, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri S. K. Beriwal, Standing counsel with Smt. B. Maithy, Advocate for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri Pankaj Shrivastava, Panel lawyer for the respondent No. 2.

None for the Respondent No. 3.

ORAL ORDER

(16th February, 2006)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition challenging his allocation to the State of Chhattisgarh. Learned counsel for the petitioner, on instruction, submits that this petitioner seeks to withdraw this petition, as having become infructuous, to which learned counsel for the respondents No. 1 and 2 have no objection.

2. In view of the above, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn, having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur